Reg. No. GR/RNP/GOA/32

RNI No. GOAENG/2002/6410

Panaji, 3rd July, 2014 (Asadha 12, 1936)

SERIES II No. 14

OFFICIAL GAZETTE

GOVERNMENT OF GOA

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

Note:- There are three Extraordinary issues to the Official Gazette, Series II No. 13 dated 26-06-2014 as follows:—

(1) Extraordinary dated 26-06-2014 from pages 219 to 222 regarding Order/Notification from Department of Finance (Revenue & Control Division).

(2) Extraordinary No. 2 dated 27-06-2014 from pages 223 to 224 regarding Order from Department of Home (Home—General Division).

(3) Extraordinary No. 3 dated 30-06-2014 from pages 225 to 226 regarding Notification from Department of Elections (Goa State Election Commission).

GOVERNMENT OF GOA

Department of Education, Art & Culture

Directorate of Technical Education

College Section

—

Order

No. 11/4/97/RRP/PF/DTE/2014/779

Read: Memorandum No. DTE/ADC/11/1/43/ /2008/P.I/3442 dated 04-02-2014.

On the recommendation of the Goa Public Service Commission conveyed vide their letter No. COM/I/5/33(7)/2013/359 dated 13-12-2013, Government is pleased to appoint Shri Raghuvir Ramakant Pissurlenkar on temporary basis to the post of Associate Professor in Pharmaceutical Chemistry (Group 'A', Gazetted) at Goa College of Pharmacy, Panaji-Goa, with initial pay of ₹ 37,400/- in the pay scale of ₹ 37,400-67,000 plus Academic Grade Pay ₹ 9,000/- w.e.f. the date of joining as per the terms & conditions contained in the Memorandum cited above.

Shri Raghuvir Ramakant Pissurlenkar will be on probation for a period of two years.

He should join duties within 30 days of the receipt of this order, failing which this order is liable to be cancelled without further notice.

He has been declared fit by Medical Board, Goa Medical College & Hospital Bambolim vide letter No. 4/105/85/H/GMC/135 dated 07-03-2014. His character and antecedents have been verified and nothing adverse is reported against him as conveyed by the Sr. P. I., 'G' Branch, SBI, CID. For Dy. Commissioner of Police, Special Branch–I, C. I. D., Mumbai vide O. W. No. 2475/TR.80/14/G/ /SBI/Gaikwad/14 dated 07-04-2014.

This is issued with the approval of the Office of the Chief Electoral Officer, Altinho, Panaji-Goa vide letter No. 5-17-2014/ELEC/(Part-II)/291 dated 07-04-2014.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Vivek B. Kamat, Director & ex officio Additional Secretary (Technical Education).

Porvorim, 24th June, 2014.

————

Order

No. 11/4/98/AAM/PF/DTE/2014/781

Read: Memorandum No. DTE/ADC/11/1/43/ /2008/P.I/3440 dated 04-02-2014.

On the recommendation of the Goa Public Service Commission conveyed vide their letter No. COM/I/5/33(6)/2013/340 dated 28-11-2013, Government is pleased to appoint Dr. Anand Avinash Mahajan on temporary basis to the post of Associate Professor in Pharmaceutical Analysis (Group 'A', Gazetted) at Goa College of Pharmacy, Panaji-Goa, with initial pay of ₹ 37,400/- in the pay scale of ₹ 37,400-67,000 plus Academic Grade Pay ₹ 9,000/- w.e.f. the date of joining as per the terms & conditions contained in the Memorandum cited above.

Dr. Anand Avinash Mahajan will be on probation for a period of two years.

He should join duties within 30 days of the receipt of this order, failing which this order is liable to be cancelled without further notice.

He has been declared fit by Medical Board, Goa Medical College & Hospital Bambolim vide letter No. 4/105/85/H/GMC/2014/131 dated 06-03-2014. His character and antecedents have been verified and nothing adverse is reported against him as conveyed by the ACP SB–II, Pune City, Office of the Commissioner of Police, Pune City 2, Sadhu Vaswani Road, Near General Post Office, Pune vide Certificate No. SB/VERI/GP/966/2014 dated 19-04-2014.

This is issued with the approval of the Office of the Chief Electoral Officer, Altinho, Panaji-Goa vide letter No. 5-17-2014/ELEC/(Part-II)/291 dated 07-04-2014.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Vivek B. Kamat, Director & ex officio Additional Secretary (Technical Education).

Porvorim, 24th June, 2014.

———

Order

No. 11/4/99/SSG/PF/DTE/2014/818

Read: Memorandum No. DTE/ADC/11/1/43/ /2008/P.I/3443 dated 04-02-2014.

On the recommendation of the Goa Public Service Commission conveyed vide their letter No. COM/I/5/33(5)/2013/339 dated 28-11-2013, Government is pleased to appoint Shri Shailendra Shivaji Gurav on temporary basis to the post of Associate Professor in Pharmacognosy (Group 'A' Gazetted) at Goa College of Pharmacy, Panaji-Goa, with initial pay of ₹ 37,400/- in the pay scale of ₹ 37,400-67,000 plus Academic Grade Pay ₹ 9,000/- w.e.f. the date of joining as per the terms & conditions contained in the Memorandum cited above.

Shri Shailendra Shivaji Gurav will be on probation for a period of two years.

He should join duties within 30 days of the receipt of this order, failing which this order is liable to be cancelled without further notice.

He has been declared fit by Medical Board, Goa Medical College & Hospital Bambolim vide letter No. 4/105/85/H/GMC/2014/131 dated 06-03-2014. His character and antecedents have been verified and nothing adverse is reported against him as conveyed by the Superintendent of Police, Sangli vide No. DSB/VERI/DM/103/2014 dated 27-05-2014 and also letter from Additional District Magistrate, Sangli No. Home-1/Desk-6/veri/SR/742/14 dated 31-05-2014.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Vivek B. Kamat, Director & ex officio Additional Secretary (Technical Education).

Porvorim, 26th June, 2014.

———◆◆◆———

Department of Home

Home—General Division

—

Order

No. 1/21/2012-HD(G)/2189

Read: 1. Government order No. 1/6/2008-HD(G) dated 15-02-2011.
2. Government order No. 1/21/2012-HD(G) dated 19-06-2012.
3. Government order No. 1/21/2012-HD(G)/ /1800 dated 04-06-2013.

Government of Goa is pleased to extend the services of Shri B. S. Nabar, as Consultant/OSD, FSL, Verna on contract basis for a further period of one year w.e.f. 01-04-2014 to 31-03-2015 on a consolidated remuneration of ₹ 40,000/- per month on the same terms and conditions.

The expenditure on the extension of services of Mr. B. S. Nabar as Consultant/OSD shall be met from XIth Plan Project under Central Scheme.

This issues with the concurrence of Finance (Budget) Department vide their U.O. No. 1456119/ /F dated 08-04-2014.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Neetal P. Amonkar, Under Secretary (Home).

Porvorim, 25th June, 2014.

———◆◆◆———

Department of Information and Publicity

——

Order

No. DI/INF/ESG/IFFI/10/1012

In pursuance of Rule 5 of the Rules of Entertainment Society of Goa, Old GMC Complex, Panaji Goa, Government of Goa is pleased to reconstitute the General Body of the Society as follows, with immediate effect:

Chief Minister of the State (ex officio Chairman)	Shri Manohar Parrikar, Chief Minister.
Vice-Chairman	Shri Damodar alias Damu Gajanan Naik Chairman, Ravindra Bhavan, Margao.
Member Secretary	Chief Executive Officer, ESG.
12 representatives from Government Departments including two from Departments of Government of India	1. Chief Secretary. 2. Finance Secretary. 3. Secretary (Information & Publicity). 4. Director, Art & Culture. 5. Director, Information & Publicity. 6. Vaidehi Naik, Councillor, CCP. 7. Chairman, KTCL. 8. Chairman, GTDC. 9. MLA, Thivim. 10. MLA, Calangute. 11. GOI nominee. 12. GOI mominee.
03 persons from other similar Societies or autonomous bodies	1. Shri Sushant Khedekar, Vice-Chairman, Kala Academy. 2. Shri Rajendra Talak, Film Maker. 3. Shri Purnanand Chari.
03 persons having proven track record in the field of films	1. Shri Sangram Gaikwad. 2. Shri Nilesh Newalkar. 3. Shri Sharmad Raiturcar, Film Cameraman.
03 eminent persons in the field of entertainment	1. Shri Melvin Fernandes. 2. Shri Shiva Baba Naik, Leading Film Organizer. 3. Shri Nanda Honawarkar.
05 persons who in the view of Government in worthy of helping Society to realize its objectives	1. Shri Soiru Varde. 2. Smt. Minaxi Martins. 3. Shri Anand Masur. 4. Shri Dharmanand Vernekar. 5. Shri Sandip Kundaikar.

The tenure of the General Body shall be for a period of three years. The Chairman, Member Secretary and Members will be eligible for re-appointment. However, the Government shall have the authority to terminate the membership of any member including the Member Secretary at any time.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Sandip Jacques, Director & ex officio Additional Secretary (Information & Publicity).

Panaji, 23rd June, 2014.

Order

No. DI/INF/ESG/IFFI/10/1013

In pursuance of Rule 6 of the Rules of Entertainment Society of Goa, Old GMC Complex, Panaji Goa, Government of Goa is pleased to reconstitute the Governing Body of the Society as follows, with immediate effect:

Chairman of the Governing Body (ex officio Chairman)	Shri Damodar alias Damu Gajanan Naik, Chairman, Ravindra Bhavan, Margao.
Member Secretary of General Body (ex officio Member Secretary)	Chief Executive Officer, Member Secretary, General Body.
05 Official members from amongst official members of the General Body	1. Chief Secretary. 2. Finance Secretary. 3. Secretary (Information & Publicity). 4. Director, Art & Culture. 5. Director, Information & Publicity.
04 non-official members from amongst the non-official members of the General Body	1. Shri Sushant Khedekar. 2. Shri Sharmad Raiturcar. 3. Shri Shiva Baba Naik. 4. Shri Rajendra Talak.
05 Special invitees	1. Shri Purnanand Chari. 2. Shri Melvin Fernandes. 3. Shri Sandip Kundaikar. 4. Shri Nilesh Newalkar. 5. Shri Soiru Varde.

The tenure of the Governing Body shall be for a period of three years. The Chairman, Member Secretary and Members will be eligible for re-appointment. However, the Government shall have the authority to terminate the membership of any member including the Member Secretary at any time.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Sandip Jacques, Director & ex officio Additional Secretary (Information & Publicity).

Panaji, 23rd June, 2014.

Department of Labour

––

Notification

No. 28/1/2014-Lab/151

The following award passed by the Labour Court-II, at Panaji-Goa on 13-01-2014 in reference No. LC-II/IT/19/2013 is hereby published as required by Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947).

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Shashank V. Thakur, Under Secretary (Labour).

Porvorim, 24th February, 2014.

––––––––

THE LABOUR COURT-II
GOVERNMENT OF GOA
AT PANAJI

(Before Shri Suresh N. Narulkar, Hon'ble Presiding Officer)

Ref. No. LC-II/IT/19/2013

Shri Nitesh Redkar,
H. No. 1142, Soccor,
Maina, Post Porvorim,
Bardez-Goa ..... Workman/Party-I

V/s

The Executive Director,
M/s. Goa Costal Resorts
& Recreation Pvt. Ltd. (Casino Paradise),
Hotel Neo Majestic,
Plot No. 6104/1A, Opp. Azad Bhavan,
Porvorim-Goa 403521 ..... Employer/Party-II

Workman/Party-I remained absent.

Employer/Party-II represented by Adv. Shri P. Chawdikar.

Panaji, Dated: 13-01-2014.

AWARD

In exercise of the powers conferred by Clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947), the Government of Goa, by Order dated 21-05-2013 bearing No. 28/12/2013-LAB/372 referred the following dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal of Goa. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court thereafter assigned the present reference to the Labour Court-II for its adjudication vide order dated 29-05-2013.

"(1) Whether the action of the Management of M/s. Goa Costal Resorts & Recreation Private Limited (Casino Paradise), Hotel Neo Majestic, Porvorim-Goa, in refusing employment to its Workman, Shri Nitesh Redkar, Dealer Inspector, with effect from 03-05-2012, at the place of posting on the contention of transfer without any transfer order amounts to termination of the service of the said workman with effect from 03-05-2012 and if so, whether it is legal and justified?

(2) If not, what relief, the Workman is entitled to?"

2. On receipt of the reference, a case was registered under No. LC-II/IT /19/13 and registered A/D notice was issued to the Parties. In pursuance to the said notice, the Parties put in their appearance. The workman/Party I (for short "Workman") initially present in person. The workman has however subsequently failed to appear before this court on the schedule date of hearings. Consequently, the workman failed to file his Statement of Claim, setting forth his ground of challenge of termination of his services. The Employer/Party II (for short "Employer") represented by Adv. Shri P. Chawdikar and filed a joint application dated 07-10-2013 for award in terms of settlement along with memorandum of settlement signed under section 2(P) read with section 18(1) of the I. D. Act, 1947 and a receipt of payment of money. The said application for Award in terms of settlement signed by the parties has been dismissed vide order of this court dated 18-12-2013.

3. Heard Ld. Adv. Shri P. Chawdikar appearing for the Employer.

4. In the case of **Baldev Singh v/s The Judge, Central Government Industrial Tribunal & Labour Court & ors., reported in 2007 II CLR 685,** the Hon'ble High Court of Rajasthan by referring the judgment of Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Virendra Bhandri v/s Rajasthan State Road Corporation Ltd., & ors reported in (2002) 9 SCC** observed as under:

" ..... a reference of certain Industrial Dispute was made to the Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court. The workman did not appear before the Tribunal, therefore, Tribunal held that there remains no Industrial Dispute. However, subsequently, the Appropriate Government again referred the dispute to the Tribunal on the same question and on this occasion, the Tribunal adjudicated the matter and made an award. The High Court held that the finding recorded by the Tribunal in the first reference

amounted to an "award" and, therefore, second reference was incompetent. The Honourable Apex Court held that all that was stated was that the parties concerned had not appeared before the Tribunal and in such an event, the Tribunal should have noted its inability to record the finding on the issue referred to it, not that the dispute itself does not exist. When there is no adjudication of the matter on merits, it cannot be said that the industrial dispute does not exist. If the industrial dispute still exists as is opined by the Government, such a matter can be referred under Section 10 of the I.D. Act, as Industrial Disputes are preferred to the Labour Court or the Industrial Tribunal for maintenance of industrial peace and not merely for adjudication of the dispute between two private parties. Therefore, it was permissible for the Government to have made the second reference.....".

The principle laid down by the Hon'ble High Court in its aforesaid judgment binds a precedent upon me.

5. Applying the law laid down by the Hon'ble High Court in its aforesaid judgment, in the case in hand, no pleadings have been filed by the workman as well as Employer before this court and as such I am unable to record the findings on the issue referred to me.

6. In the circumstances, I pass the following order:

ORDER

1. It is hereby held that this court is unable to record the finding on the issue referred by the Appropriate Government.
2. No order as to costs.
3. Inform the Government accordingly.

Sd/-

(Suresh N. Narulkar)
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court-II.

_____

Notification

No. 28/1/2014-Lab/150

The following award passed by the Labour Court-II, at Panaji-Goa on 16-01-2014 in reference No. LC-II/IT/9/2013 is hereby published as required by Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947).

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Shashank V. Thakur, Under Secretary (Labour).

Porvorim, 24th February, 2014.

_____

IN THE LABOUR COURT-II
GOVERNMENT OF GOA
AT PANAJI

(Before Shri Suresh N. Narulkar, Hon'ble Presiding Officer)

Case No. Ref. LC-II/IT/9/2013

Shri Vitesh Joshi,
H. No. 21, Near El-Capitan Centre,
Fair Alto, Mapusa,
Bardez-Goa ... ... Workman/Party I

V/s

The Executive Director/Operations Head,
M/s. Golden Peace Hotels and Resorts
Private Limited (Casino Paradise),
Neo Majestic, Porvorim,
Bardez-Goa ..... Employer/Party II

Workman/Party I remained absent.

Employer/Party II represented by Adv. Shri P. Chawdikar.

Panaji, Dated: 16-01-2014.

AWARD

1. In exercise of the powers conferred by Clause (c) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947), the Government of Goa, by Order dated 22-04-2013, bearing No. 28/14/2013-LAB/187, referred the following dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Goa. The Hon'ble P.O., Industrial Tribunal--cum-Labour Court, in turn assigned the present reference to this Labour Court-II vide order dated 29-04-2013.

"(1) Whether the action of the Management of M/s. Golden Peace Hotels and Resorts Private Limited (Casino Paradise), Neo Majestic, Porvorim, Bardez-Goa, in terminating the services of Shri Vitesh Vasant Joshi, Club Security, with effect from 04-03-2012, is legal and justified?

(2) If not, to what relief, the Workman is entitled?"

2. On receipt of the reference, a case was registered under No. LC-II/IT/09/2013 and

registered A/D notice was issued to the Parties. In pursuance to the said notice, the Parties put in their appearance. The Workman/Party I (for short, 'Workman') was initially represented by Adv. Shri G. Kubal and undertakes to file his wakalatanama on behalf of the Workman. That however, Adv. Shri G. Kubal neither filed his wakalatanama nor filed any Statement of Claim on behalf of the Workman. On the subsequent scheduled date of hearings, i.e. on and from 23-09-2013, neither the Workman nor his Adv. Shri G. Kubal appeared before this court. The Employer/Party II (for short, 'Employer) was represented by Adv. Shri P. Chawdikar.

3. The Employer filed an application for award in terms of settlement signed by both the parties i.e. the Workman as well as the Employer which is on record at Exb.4. The said application at Exb.4 is supported by a notarized copy of memorandum of settlement u/s 2 (p) read with section 18(1) of the I. D. Act, 1947 signed between the parties herein above before Mrs. Meera Medhekar an Advocate and Notary, having her office at Pinto Chambers, S.V. Road, Panaji-Goa and a copy of receipt of payment of amount Rs. 40,000/- (Rupees Forty thousand only) to the workman. In the said application for award in terms of settlement, the parties have stated that pursuant to the recording of failure of the conciliation proceedings with regards to the dispute raised by the workman before the Assistant Labour Commissioner, he approached them on 26-03-2013 and requested for settlement of his matter amicably. The parties stated that the Workman requested for dues and for relieving him from his duties pursuant to the said failure report. The parties further stated that after prolonged and protracted discussions, they finally arrived at a settlement. The parties therefore submitted that the Workman is having no claim of whatsoever nature against them and that he does not wish to pursue to the present reference and treat the said reference as settled. The parties therefore prayed that no dispute award be passed in terms of settlement.

4. Ample opportunities were given to the Workman to comment over the said application for award in terms of settlement at Exb.4. However the Workman failed to remain present before this court on scheduled date of hearings either in person or through his duly authorized representative. Consequently, the Workman failed to file any reply to the aforesaid application for award in terms of settlement at Exb. 4. In the circumstances, I have no reason to disbelieve the contents of the said application at Exb. 4.

5. I have carefully perused the memorandum of settlement signed between the Management of the Employer Company and the Workman under Sec. 2 (p) read with sec. 18 (1) of the I. D. Act, 1947. In my opinion the terms of the said settlement signed between the parties are beneficial to the Workman under reference. It also helps in keeping peaceful harmonious industrial relations between the parties and hence I consented for the same. Since the parties have settled the matter amicably between themselves, nothing survives in the matter.

In view of the above discussion and with regards to the facts and circumstances of the case, I pass the following order:

ORDER

1. That in view of the amicable settlement between the parties hereto, the dispute as to "Whether the action of the Management of M/s. Golden Peace Hotels and Resorts Private Limited (Casino Paradise), Neo Majestic, Porvorim, Bardez-Goa, in terminating the services of the Workman under reference, with effect from 04-03-2012, is legal and justified" does not survive.

2. No order as to costs.

3. Inform the Government accordingly.

Sd/-

(Suresh N. Narulkar)
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court-II.

_____

Notification

No. 28/1/2013-Lab/742

The following award passed by the Industrial Tribunal and Labour Court at Panaji-Goa on 04-10-2013 in reference No. LC-II/IT/07/13 is hereby published as required by Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947).

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Shashank V. Thakur, Under Secretary (Labour).

Porvorim, 4th November, 2013.

THE LABOUR COURT-II
GOVERNMENT OF GOA
AT PANAJI

(Before Shri Suresh N. Narulkar, Hon'ble Presiding Officer)

Case No. Ref. LC-II/IT/07/13

Shri Nicholas Fernandes,
H No. 286/1, Moloca Merces,
Ilhas-Goa-403005 ... Workman/Party I
V/s

The Executive Director/Operation Head,
M/s. Golden Peace Hotels & Resorts Pvt. Ltd.,
(Casino Paradise), Hotel Neo Majestic,
Plot No. 6104/1A, opp. Azad Bhavan,
Porvorim-Goa-403521 ... Employer/Party II

Workman/Party-I remained absent.

Employer/Party-II represented by Adv. P. Chawdikar

Panaji, Dated: 04-10-2013.

AWARD

1. In exercise of the powers conferred by Clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947), the Government of Goa, by Order dated 22-04-2013, bearing No. 28/16/2013-LAB/189, referred the following dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal of Goa. The Hon'ble Industrial Tribunal--cum-Labour Court thereafter assigned the present reference to this Labour Court-II for its adjudication vide its order dated 29-04-2013.

> 1. "Whether the action of the Management of M/s Golden Peace Hotels & Resorts Private Limited (Casino Paradise), Neo Majestic, Porvorim, Bardez-Goa, in terminating the services of its workman, Shri Nicholas Fernandes, Senior Dealer, with effect from 21-03-2012, is legal and justified?
>
> 2. If not, to what relief the Workman is entitled?"

2. On receipt of the reference, a case was registered under No. LC-II/IT/07/2013 and registered A/D notice was issued to the Parties. In pursuance to the said notice, the Employer/ /Party II (for short, "Employer") put in their appearance. The Workman/Party I (for short 'Workman'), served with registered post A.D. The workman was initially represented by Adv. Shri G. Kubal. However subsequently, neither the workman nor Adv. Shri G. Kubal remained present in this Labour Court-II on the scheduled date of hearings. Consequently no Claim Statement has been filed on behalf of the workman. Ld. Adv. Shri P. Chawdikar representing the Employer orally submitted that as the Workman did not file his Claim Statement, the Employer also does not wish to file its Written Statement.

3. Heard Ld. Adv. Shri P. Chawdikar appearing for the Employer.

4. In the case of **Baldev Singh v/s The Judge, Central Government Industrial Tribunal & Labour Court & ors., reported in 2007 II CLR 685**, the Hon'ble High Court of Rajasthan by referring the judgment of Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Virendra Bhandri v/s Rajasthan State Road Corporation Ltd., & ors reported in (2002) 9 SCC** observed as under:

> "...a reference of certain Industrial Dispute was made to the Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court. The workman did not appear before the Tribunal, therefore, Tribunal held that there remains no Industrial Dispute. However, subsequently, the Appropriate Government again referred the dispute to the Tribunal on the same question and on this occasion, the Tribunal adjudicated the matter and made an award. The High Court held that the finding recorded by the Tribunal in the first reference amounted to an "award" and, therefore, second reference was incompetent. The Honourable Apex Court held that all that was stated was that the parties concerned had not appeared before the Tribunal and in such an event, the Tribunal should have noted its inability to record the finding on the issue referred to it, not that the dispute itself does not exist. When there is no adjudication of the matter on merits, it cannot be said that the industrial dispute does not exist. If the industrial dispute still exists as is opined by the Government, such a matter can be referred under Section 10 of the I. D. Act, as Industrial Disputes are preferred to the Labour Court or the Industrial Tribunal for maintenance of industrial peace and not merely for adjudication of the dispute between two private parties. Therefore, it was permissible for the Government to have made the second reference...".

The principle laid down by the Hon'ble High Court in its aforesaid judgment binds a precedent upon me.

5. Applying the law laid down by the Hon'ble High Court in its aforesaid judgement, in the case in hand no pleadings have been filed by the workman as well as Employer before this court and as such I am unable to record the findings on the issue referred to me.

6. In the circumstances, I pass the following order:

ORDER

1. It is hereby held that this court is unable to record the findings on the issue referred by the Appropriate Government.

2. No order as to cost.

3. Inform the Government accordingly.

Sd/-
(Suresh N. Narulkar)
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court-II.

_____

Notification

No. 28/1/2014-Lab/111

The following award passed by the Industrial Tribunal and Labour Court at Panaji-Goa on 12-11-2013 in reference No. IT/19/10 is hereby published as required by Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947).

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Shashank V. Thakur, Under Secretary (Labour).

Porvorim, 10th February, 2014.

_____

IN THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AND
LABOUR COURT
GOVERNMENT OF GOA
AT PANAJI

(Before Ms. Bimba K. Thaly, Presiding Officer)

Ref. No. IT/19/10

Ms. Ganga S. Mane Raibagkar,
H. No. 527, Khursachi Ghol,
Near GMC, Bambolim-Goa. ..... Workman/Party I

V/s

M/s. T & A, 10 & 11,
Navelkar Arcade, A. B. Road,
Near Hotel Nova Goa,
Panaji, Goa. ... Employer/Party II

Ld. representative Shri Subhash Naik for Workman/Party I.

Adv. Shri P. Chawdikar for Employer/Party II.

AWARD

(Passed on 12th day of November, 2013)

By order dated 11-2-10, bearing No. 28/3/2010--LAB, the Government of Goa in exercise of powers conferred by Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (for short The Act), has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication.

"(1) Whether the action of the management of M/s T & A, 10 & 11, Navelkar Arcade, A.B. Road, Near Hotel Nova Goa, Panaji, in terminating the services of Ms. Ganga Shankar Mane Raibagkar, Salesgirl, with effect from 10-11-2004, is legal and justified?

(2) If not, what relief the workman is entitled to?"

2. Upon receipt of the reference, it was registered as IT/19/10 and registered A. D. notices were issued to both the parties. Pursuant to service of notices Shri Subhash Naik appeared for Party I and Adv. Shri P. Chawdikar appeared for Party II. Party I filed the claim statement at Exb. 6 and Party II filed the written statement at Exb. 7 Party I then filed the rejoinder at Exb. 8.

3. In the claim statement it is in short the case of Party I that she was employed with Party II in their showroom as Salesgirl w. e. f. 11-10-03 and that her services were abruptly terminated w. e. f. 10-11-04. It is stated that at the time of termination no one months notice was given and no retrenchment compensation was paid in terms of Sec. 25F of the Act. It is stated that Party I had completed 240 days of service during a period of 12 months prior to her termination. It is stated that Party II did not comply with Sec. 25G and 25H of the Act. It is stated that Party I raised an industrial dispute before Party II and thereafter before the Labour Commissioner demanding reinstatement in service with full back wages and continuity in service and that Party II though declined to reinstate her, paid the earned wages due to her. Hence, the prayer to reinstate her in service with full back wages and continuity of service with costs.

4. In the written statement Party II has denied the case set up by Party I and has stated that the present dispute is not an industrial dispute and that there has not been termination of the workman but she had given up her job of her own free will for the reasons best known to her. It is stated that since Party I left the services of her own free will there was no question of complying

Sec. 25F so also Sec. 25G and 25H of the Act. It is stated that Party I has issued receipt in favour of Party II in the presence of Labour Commissioner towards receipt of earned wages and in the said receipt, Party II did not make any claim of whatsoever nature against the management of Party II.

5. On the basis of averments in the pleadings of the parties, issues dated 8-7-11 at Exb.10 were framed.

6. In support of her case Party I examined herself as witness No.1 and closed the case and even Party II by examining Mr. Randolf Mendes closed their case.

7. Heard Ld. Rep. Shri Subhash Naik for Party I and Ld. Adv. Shri P. Chawdikar for Party II.

8. In his arguments Ld. Representative of Party I submitted that Party II has not disputed that Party I has completed 240 days of work and that they have not complied with Section 25F of the Act. He stated that in case Party I left the services, it was for Party II to have issued letter to Party I asking her to report for work which Party II failed to do and therefore it is apparent that Party II illegally terminated the services of Party I. According to him the plea taken by Party II that Party I had left the services on her own is an afterthought. He stated that merely because Party I was paid earned wages by Party II, the same cannot be construed to mean that Party I had surrendered all her rights. In support of his above submission, Ld. Representative of Party I relied on the judgment in the case of **Nar Singh Pal v/s. Union of India, 2001 LLJ 1938.** He further stated that in case this court does not grant reinstatement of Party I, substantial amount towards compensation be granted to Party I. He also made it clear that Party I is not pressing his claim as regards violation of Section 25-G of the Act.

9. On the other hand, Ld. Advocate for Party II stated that Party I was employed as daily wager that no appointment letter was issued while employing her and even no termination letter was issued for terminating her services. By inviting my attention to the receipt dated 12-4-07 (Exb. 12) pertaining to payment of dues to Party I, he stated there is no claim for reinstatement in this receipt issued by Party I and on the contrary it is stated therein that Party I has no claim of whatsoever nature against the management. He stated that Party I sent letter dated 15-12-08 (Exb. 14) to the Asstt. Labour Commissioner which is almost after four years from the date of alleged termination. He then by inviting my attention to the letter dated 22-2-05 which is marked as 'x subject to proof' stated that court has powers to compare the signature of author of this letter with that of other admitted documents signed by Party I and which if done would reveal that the said letter dated 22-02-05 is signed by Party I and that she had left the services on her own. By referring to Form 19 pertaining to Employees' Provident Fund Scheme, 1952 he stated that this form has been filled up by the Party I after the date of alleged termination or her services without mentioning therein that her services are illegally terminated. Thus according to him all the above factors taken together would lead to the conclusion that Party I left the job on her own.

10. I have gone through the records of the case and have duly considered the arguments advanced.

11. I am reproducing herewith the issues along with their findings and reasons thereof:

Sr. No.	Issues	Findings
1.	Whether the Party I proves that Party II has terminated her services w. e. f. 10-11-04?	In the negative.
2.	Whether the Party I proves that her termination is in violation of Sec. 25F & 25G of the Act?	In the negative.
3.	Whether the Party II proves that the Party I had left the services of her own will?	In the positive.
4.	What relief? what order?	As per Award below.

REASONS

12. *Issue Nos. 1 & 3*: Both these issues are answered together for the sake of convenience, as they are interlinked.

13. It is all throughout the case of Party I that Party II terminated her services w. e. f. 10-11-04. In her evidence, though Party I has stated that her services were terminated on 10-11-04, no documentary evidence on the above subject has been produced by Party I. On the contrary, in her cross examination Party I has made it clear that she was not issued termination letter by Party II while terminating her services. In her affidavit in evidence, Party I has stated that at the time of termination, she was not paid legal dues such as gratuity, leave wages, retrenchment

compensation and that after her termination she complained to Labour Commissioner, Panaji and due to his intervention, she was paid difference in minimum wages, earned wages, gratuity and leave wages in the office of Labour Commissioner.

14. In her cross examination Party I was shown xerox copy of receipt dated 12-4-07 which is acknowledgement by her of receipt of all her legal dues including gratuity, leave wages etc. from the management of Party II and Party I has admitted her signature on the same and accordingly the same is marked as Exb.12. Party I has produced in her cross examination complaint dated 18-4-05 made by her to the Labour Commissioner, at Exb.13 and also copy of letter dated 15-12-08 by which she had informed the Labour Commissioner about termination of services at Exb.14.

15. Perusal of letter dated 18-4-05 at Exb. 13 reveals that it is nowhere stated by Party I in this letter that her services are terminated by Party II or that she had left the job and what appears from the contents of this letter is that the brother of the shop owner is rude, that he harasses her everyday, that the owner of the shop does not listen to her and is not bothered about the issue and that the said brother of the owner has told her to leave the job without her single mistake. Thus, vide this letter addressed to Labour Commissioner, Party I has requested him to conduct a thorough investigation and give her justice. In her letter/ /complaint dated 15-12-08 at Exb.14, addressed to the Asstt. Labour Commissioner Party I has stated about illegal termination of her services by Party II w. e. f. 10-11-04 so also about she raising industrial dispute with Party II and the Party II only paying her wages but not reinstating her in service with full back wages and continuity of service. Vide this letter she has demanded reinstatement in service with full back wages and continuity of service with costs.

16. In her cross examination Party I has admitted that the above letter/complaint dated 15-12-08 at Exh.14 was made after issuing receipt dated 12-4-07 at Exb. 12. It is pertinent to note that in Exb.12 Party I has acknowledged receipt of amount of Rs. 3510/- from Party II towards all her legal dues including gratuity, leave wages etc. by further stating therein that she has no claim of whatsoever nature against Party II nor does she owe anything to the management. Thus, Exb. 12 gives a clear indication that Party I did not have any claim of whatsoever nature against Party II as on 12-4-07 i.e. when the said receipt came to be issued and therefore the grievance made by Party I in the complaint dated 15-12-08 at Exb. 14 does not appear to be sound. Even for that matter the act of Party I of writing the letter/complaint dated 15-12-08 (Exb.14) after almost four years after the date of alleged termination which is 10-11-2004, also speaks volumes as, in normal course grievance of illegal termination would be made by a person soon after the termination of services.

17. Be that as it may, Party I has stated in her cross examination that prior to filing of the letter/ /complaint dated 15-12-08 (Exb.14) she had filed another application addressed to the Labour Commissioner stating that her termination was illegal and unjustified and to reinstate her with continuity in service and full back wages. She has further stated that she cannot produce the copy of the said application. She has however denied the suggestion that she cannot produce the said copy because she never made such application. To my mind, in case Party I had addressed any application to the Labour Commissioner on the subject, as mentioned above prior to complaint/letter dated 15-12-08 (Exb.14) or even prior to receipt of amount vide Exb.12 dated 12-4-07 Party I would definitely have a copy of the same with her. Non-production of said copy on record, leads me to draw adverse inference against Party I that she had no any claim against Party II at the time when she issued the receipt dated 12-4-07 at Exb. 12. The above aspect further leads me to draw adverse inference that complaint/letter dated 15-12-08 at Exb. 14 is by way of after thought and that as stated by Party II, Party I had left the job out of her own free will.

18. Party I was also shown application/Form 19 for claiming Provident Fund, pertaining to Employees Provident Fund Scheme and she has identified her signature at three places on the same. It is marked as Exb. 15. Party I has stated that after she left the job, she collected her provident fund amount. She has stated that she cannot say if the said amount was collected by her before filing of the complaint at Exb. 14. She has admitted that in Exb.15 she has mentioned the reason for leaving the job as "Break" and that it is nowhere mentioned in Exb.15 that her services were terminated by Party II. It may be mentioned here that it is otherwise stated by Party I that during the time when she was in employment, the employer never used to give break in service. The above statement made by Party I runs contrary to the reason of leaving the job, as stated by her in Exb.15 and therefore it is apparent that the statements made by Party I are self contradictory. Consequently no any inference could be drawn on the basis of Exb. 15.

19. It deserves to be noted that there is otherwise no dispute on the part of Party II that Party I had completed 240 days of service during a period of 12 months, however the advantage of applicability of Sec. 25F of the Act would be available to Party I only if she succeeds in establishing that she was retrenched by Party II. Discussion aforesaid makes it clear that Party I has failed to prove that Party II had terminated her services w. e. f. 10-11-04 and what appears from the aforesaid discussion is that Party I voluntarily left the services. It is brought on record in the cross examination of Shri Randolf Mendes by the Ld. Representative of Party I that Party II did not send any letter to Party I after 10-11-04 asking her the reason for not reporting to duties but Shri Randolf Mendes has stated that such practice has never being followed by their establishment. It is further brought on record in his cross-examination that Party II did not issue letter or memo to Party I for not reporting for duty after 10-11-04. Nevertheless, as above discussion makes it clear that Party I voluntarily left the services, the question of Party II sending any letter to Party I after 10-11-04 asking her the reason for not reporting to duties or issuing her letter or memo for not reporting for duty after 10-11-04, does not arise.

20. A note also deserves to be taken of the document shown to Party I in her cross--examination which is the xerox copy of the complaint dated 22-2-05 addressed to Labour Commissioner, allegedly signed by Party I. Upon being shown this document, Party I has stated that the signature on this letter does not appear to be hers. This document is taken on record however is marked "x" subject to proof. Though strictly speaking this document cannot be read in evidence as its proof is not established but reading of this document gives a clear indication that the signatory to this letter who has signed above the name "Ganga R. Raibagkar (Mane)" has mentioned in this letter that the boss used to harass her to leave the job and so she got frustrated and left. The above reason mentioned in the letter by the signatory to this letter makes it clear that the concerned person left the job on her own, may be for the reason mentioned therein. If one compares the signature of the author of this letter with that or the signature of Party I, on the letter dated 18-4-05 (Exb.13) as well as on the receipt dated 12-4-07 at Exb.12, one can safely conclude that the signature on the letter dated 22-2-05 (x subject to proof) is of Party I. Thus, there is prima facie material on the basis of this document to draw the inference that Party I left the job on her own.

21. Though observations in the judgment in the case of **Nar Singh Pal (supra)** indicate that mere acceptance of retrenchment compensation by the workman does not mean that he has surrendered all his constitutional rights but as discussion supra reveals that Party I left the job on her own, the question of applying above observations to the fact situation in the instant case, does not arise. Thus, in view of discussion supra, Issue No. 1 is answered in the negative whereas Issue No. 3 is answered in the positive.

22. *Issue No. 2*: In view of findings given in issue Nos. 1 and 3 above, the question of Party II complying with provisions of Section 25F and 25 G of the Act does not arise. Hence my findings.

23. In the result and in view of discussion supra, I pass the following:

ORDER

1. It is hereby held that the action of the management of M/s T & A, 10 & 11, Navelkar Arcade, A. B. Road, near Hotel Nova Goa, Panaji, in terminating the services of Ms. Ganga Shankar Mane Raibagkar, Salesgirl, with effect from 10-11-2004, is legal and justified.

2. Party I/workman is therefore not entitled to any relief.

3. No order as to costs

Inform the Government accordingly.

Sd/-
(Bimba K. Thaly)
Presiding Officer
Industrial Tribunal-
-cum-Labour-Court.

◆◆◆

Department of Mines

Directorate of Mines & Geology

Order

No. 01/SC-MACPS/ADM/MINES/2013/832

Read: 1) Circular No. 1/1/82-PER (PART-VI) dated 06-08-2009 of Under Secretary (Personnel-I), Government of Goa.

2) Notification No. 13/7/2000/GAD II dated 20th June, 2006 of the Under Secretary (GA), Government of Goa.

3) Order No. 01/219/09/ADM/Mines/1839 dated 15-08-2009 of Director of Mines & Geology, Panaji-Goa.

In pursuance to the Office Memorandum read at preamble (1) above, the Departmental Screening Committee for Group 'C' posts under Directorate of Mines & Geology is hereby reconstituted for the purpose of considering the cases for grant of financial up-gradation under Modified Assured Career Progression Scheme. The composition of Group 'C' Screening Committee is as under:

1) Director of Mines & Geology — Chairman.
2) Asst. Director of Mines-I — Member.
3) Under Secretary, Finance (Exp.) — Member.

This supersedes earlier Order No. 01/219/09/ /ADM/Mines/1839 dated 15-08-2009.

This issues with approval of Government vide U.O. No. 6882/F dated 30-07-2013.

Prasanna A. Acharya, Director & ex officio Jt. Secretary (Mines & Geology).

Panaji, 24th June, 2014.

Department of Personnel

Order

File No. 12/1/2013-PER(A)/3997

Read: Order No. 12/1/2013-PER (A) dated 20-06-2014.

Consequent upon above promotion, the following transfer and posting of Superintendents (outside Secretariat) are as follows:

Sr. No.	Name of the Officer	Posting on promotion
1.	Smt. Kavita H. Nipanikar	Dte. of Civil Supplies.
2.	Smt. Maria Wanda Sequeira	Dte. of Women & Child Development.
3.	Shri Uday G. Keni	Vigilance Department.
4.	Smt. Maria A. Braganza	Electricity Department.
5.	Shri K. B. Salgaonkar	Excise Department.
6.	Smt. Deepa D. Banaulikar	Town & Country Planning.
7.	Shri H. B. Khedekar	Commercial Taxes.

Following transfer/posting of Superintendents (outside Secretariat) are effected.

Sr. No.	Name of the Officer	Present posting	Posted on transfer
1.	Smt. Ashwita Redkar	Comm., Labour & Employment	W.R.D., Margao.
2.	Smt. C. S. Redkar	Education Department	Inspectorate General of of Prisons.
3.	Smt. Chagan Pednekar	D. H. S.	G. M. C.
4.	Shri Rajendra Arlekar	Town & Country Planning	Education Department.
5.	Shri Mangaldas Kondvilkar	Electricity Department	Insp., Factories and Boilers.
6.	Shri Bala Korgaonkar	G. M. C.	Comm., Labour & Employment.

All the above Superintendents (outside Secretariat) shall complete their handing over and taking over formalities within 3 days i.e. on 25-06-2014 and submit compliance.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

R. Aga, Under Secretary (Personnel-II).

Panaji, 20th June, 2014.

Addendum

12/1/2013-PER(A)/3997

Read: 1) Order No. 12/1/2013-PER (A) dated 20-06-2014.

In the order of even number dated 20-06-2014 referred to above, the following name shall be added at Serial No. 7 as indicated below:

"Shri H. B. Khedekar (Gen)".

R. Aga, Under Secretary (Personnel-II).

Provorim, 23rd June, 2014.

Department of Public Health

Certificate

No. 44/4/2014-I/PHD

Read: 1) Memorandum No. 45/5/2009-I/PHD dated 24-10-2013.
2) Government Order No. 23/4/98-I/PHD dated 11-12-2013.

Certified that the character and antecedents of Dr. Ketaki Devendra Chodankar, Public Health Dentist (Group 'A', Gazetted) under Directorate of

Health Services has been verified by the District Magistrate, North Goa, Panaji vide letter No. 2/11/ /2013-MAG/VAC/1432 dated 18-06-2014 and it is revealed that there is nothing adverse reported against her.

Maria Seomara Desouza, Under Secretary (Health-II).

Porvorim, 24th June, 2014.

———◆◆◆———

Department of Revenue

—

Order

No. 22/10/2013-RD

Whereas, the Government of Goa, vide Notification No. 22/10/2013-RD dated 19-07-2013, issued under sub-section (1) of Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (Act 1 of 1894) (hereinafter referred to as the "said Act"), and published in the Official Gazette, Series II No. 17, on pages 487 to 488 dated 25-07-2013, notified that the land specified in the Schedule there of (hereinafter referred to as the "said land") is likely to be needed for public purpose viz. Land Acquisition for the permanent campus of National Institute Technology Goa (NITG) at Cuncolim, Salcete-Goa (hereinafter referred to as the "said public purpose");

And whereas, the Government of Goa, considered the report made by the Collector under sub-section (2) of Section 5-A of the said Act and on being satisfied that the said land is needed for the said public purpose, vide Notification No. 22/ /10/2013-RD dated 22-04-2014, issued under Section 6 of the said Act, and published in the Official Gazette, Series II No. 5 on pages 95 to 96 dated 02-05-2014, declared that the said land is required for the said public purpose.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 7 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (Act 1 of 1894), the Government of Goa hereby directs the Collector, North Goa District, Panaji-Goa to take the order for acquistion of the said land.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Ashutosh Apte, Under Secretary (Revenue-I).

Porvorim, 24th June, 2014.

Corrigendum/Addendum

No. 23/20/2011-RD

Read: Government Notification No. 23/20/2011-RD dated 30-08-2013, published in the Official Gazette, Series II No. 24 dated 12-09-2013 and in two local newspapers viz. (1) "Navhind Times" dated 05-09-2013 and (2) "Goa Doot" dated 05-09-2013 regarding Land Acquisition for improvement and hot-mix of road from top-cola factory Borim to Betora village panchayat office via Bedle in the length of 6.00 kms. in Shiroda Constituency.

In the schedule appended to the Notification referred to above, at survey number 93/1 (part) of village Borim the name of owners 'Ramakant Shambu Shinde and Rajesh Prabhakar Sanker' may be read as 'Ratnakant Shambu Shinde and Rajesh Prabhakar Sinkre'. Further at survey number 101/1 (part) of Village Borim, the name of owner 'Rajendra Chandrakant Shirodkar' may be added.

The rest of the contents of the above referred Notification shall remain unchanged.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Anju S. Kerkar, Under Secretary (Revenue-II).

Porvorim, 24th June, 2014.

———

Corrigendum

No. 22/10/2013-RD

Read: Order No. 22/10/2013-RD dated 24-06-2014, regarding Land Acquisition for the permanent campus of National Institute Technology Goa (NITG) at Cuncolim, Salcete-Goa.

In the last line of the last para in the above referred Order the words "Collector, North Goa District, Panaji" shall be read as "Collector, South Goa District, Margao-Goa".

The rest of the contents of above referred Notification shall remain unchanged.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Ashutosh Apte, Under Secretary (Revenue-I).

Porvorim, 2nd July, 2014.

Department of Social Welfare

—

Notification

No. 82-6-07-08-SDB/Part-II/2121

Government is pleased to notify the following panelist as expert member in the Sanctioning Committee to sanction Monthly Financial Assistance to the person engaged in Traditional Occupations/Businesses including Motorcycle Pilots.

Sr. No.	Name and address of the Member		
1	2		
1.	Premendra Vishnu Shet, Kumbharwada, Mayem, Bicholim-Goa	—	Member.
2.	Salvador Mascarenhas, Tarimol, Sanguem-Goa	—	Member.
3.	Vasudev R. Dessai, Bimbal, Collem-Goa	—	Member.
4.	Amol A. Kanekar, Nr. Police Station, Quepem	—	Member.
5.	Piety Fernandes, H. No. 373, Assolda, Copramud, Chandor-Goa	—	Member.
6.	Navnath Surlekar, Godkatad, Surla, Sakali	—	Member.
7.	Narayan B. Khandeparkar, Bazar Shiroda-Goa	—	Member.
8.	Jayesh Umesh Samant, Vanciowadda, Guirim, Bardez-Goa	—	Member.
9.	Jagannath Rajaram Parsekar, Marathwada, Mandre-Goa	—	Member.
10.	Mahesh Naik, Ardhafond Pasal Poingin, Canacona-Goa	—	Member.
11.	Satish Harmalkar, Karkacho-Vhal, Revoda, Bardez-Goa	—	Member.
12.	Chandrakant Korgaonkar, Korgao, Pernem-Goa	—	Member.
13.	Shashikant Parob, Behind Prince Bakery, Head Land Sada, Vasco-Goa	—	Member.
14.	Sagar Shiva Pednekar, H. No. 365, Dando Siolim, Bardez-Goa	—	Member.
15.	Babruwan Satelkar, H. No. 277, Caturlim, Moira, Bardez-Goa	—	Member.
16.	Dinesh G. Audi, Maddicata, Cuncolim-Goa	—	Member.

The tenure of the above penal will be three years. This is issued with the approval of the Government.

This supersedes earlier Order No. 82-6-07-08--SDB/Part-II/9580 dated 05-03-2014.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Meena Naik Goltekar, Director & ex officio Joint Secretary (Social Welfare).

Panaji, 30th June, 2014.

———

Notification

No. 82-6-07-08-SDB/Part-II/2122

Government is pleased to notify the following panelist as screening committee member under the scheme Monthly Financial Assistance to the person engaged in Traditional Occupations/ /Businesses including Motorcycle Pilots.

North Goa

1. Shri Rupesh Haldankar, Patto Ribandar, Tiswadi-Goa.

South Goa

2. Shri Pandhari Naik, Saterimol Nirankal, Ponda-Goa.

The tenure of the above penal will be three years. This is issued with the approval of the Government.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Meena Naik Goltekar, Director & ex officio Joint Secretary (Social Welfare).

Panaji, 30th June, 2014.

www.goaprintingpress.gov.in

Published and Printed by the Director, Printing & Stationery,
Government Printing Press,
Mahatma Gandhi Road, Panaji-Goa 403 001.

PRICE–Rs. 14.00

PRINTED AT THE GOVERNMENT PRINTING PRESS, PANAJI-GOA–110/350–7/2014.